

## REMARKS

### Summary

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 20, 32, 34, 46-47, 50-59, 61-63, and 65-76 were pending. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 20, 32, 34, 46-47, 50, 61-63, and 75-76 have been canceled. Claims 51, 52, 56, 65, 66, 69, and 74 have been amended. Claims 51-59 and 65-74 are now pending.

### Rejection of Claims

Claims 75 and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 75 and 76 have been canceled.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 32, 75, and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by *Johnston et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,250,816. Claims 20, 34, 46, 66-68, and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Johnston* in view of *Smith et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 7,083,051. Claims 7 and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Johnston* in view of *Smith* and in further view of *Larsen et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,365,834. Claims 50 and 52-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Johnston* in view of *Bechamps*, U.S. Patent No. 6,256,444. Claims 47, 49, 61, and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Johnston* in view of *Smith* and in further view of *Mendoza*, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0170726. Claims 56, 58, 59, 69, 70, 72, and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Johnston* in view of *Smith* and in further view of *Puetz et al.*, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0176681. Claims 51, 57, 65, and 71 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but deemed to contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 51 and 65 have been rewritten in independent form. Claims 52 and 56 have been amended to depend upon claim 51. As a result, claims 52-59 now depend, either directly or indirectly, upon claim 51. Claims 66, 69, and 74 have been amended to depend upon claim 65. As a result, claims 66-74 now depend, either directly or indirectly, upon claim 65. Thus, it is believed claims 51-59 and 65-74 are now in condition for allowance.

### Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be desirable to clear up further issues, the Examiner is

encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Applicant herein petitions for any extension of time necessary for the submission of this response. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the three-month extension fee, as well as any other fee deemed necessary for the submission of this response, except the issue fee, to Deposit Account Number 16-0228.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 7, 2009

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ch. K. Marlow', is written over a horizontal line.

Christopher K. Marlow  
Reg. No. 55,427  
Attorney for Applicants

Customer Number 32915  
Panduit Corp.  
Legal Department - TP12  
17301 S. Ridgeland Avenue  
Tinley Park, Illinois 60477-3091  
(708) 532-1800, Ext. 1369